

11-1-1990

Faculty Senate Monthly Packet November 1990

Portland State University Faculty Senate

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Follow this and additional works at: <http://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/senateminutes>

Recommended Citation

Portland State University Faculty Senate, "Faculty Senate Monthly Packet November 1990" (1990). *Faculty Senate Monthly Packets*. Paper 48.

<http://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/senateminutes/48>

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate Monthly Packets by an authorized administrator of PDXScholar. For more information, please contact pdxscholar@pdx.edu.

REVISED

TO: Senators and Ex-officio Members to the Senate

FR: Ulrich H. Hardt, Secretary to the Faculty *UHH*

The Faculty Senate will hold its regular meeting on November 5, 1990, at 3:00 p.m. in 150 Cramer Hall.

AGENDA

- A. Roll
- *B. Approval of the Minutes of the October 1, 1990, Meeting
 - President's Report -- Ramaley**
- C. Announcements and Communications from the Floor
- D. Question Period
 - 1. Questions for Administrators
 - 2. Questions from the Floor for the Chair
- E. Reports from the Officers of Administration and Committees
 - 1. Fall Term Registration Report--Ricks
 - *2. UPC Quarterly Report--Mandaville
 - 3. Report of October 5-6, 1990, IFS Meeting--Hardt
- F. Unfinished Business
- G. New Business
 - *1. Request for Name Change: The School of Extended Studies -- Lall
- H. Adjournment
 - *The following documents are included with this mailing:
 - B. Minutes of the October 1, 1990, Senate Meeting*
 - E₂ UPC Quarterly Report**
 - G₁ Request for Name Change: The School of Extended Studies**

**Included for Senators and Ex-officio Members only.

Senators are reminded that they need to turn in the name of an alternate who would attend when necessary. Please submit to the Secretary to the Faculty by November 1, 1990.

Your name

Dept.

Alternate's name

Dept.

Portland State University

MEMORANDUM

TO: Senators and Ex-officio Members to the Senate

FR: Ulrich H. Hardt, Secretary to the Faculty *M J H*

The Faculty Senate will hold its regular meeting on November 5, 1990, at 3:00 p.m. in 150 Cramer Hall.

AGENDA

- A. Roll
- *B. Approval of the Minutes of the October 1, 1990, Meeting
- C. Announcements and Communications from the Floor
- D. Question Period
 - 1. Questions for Administrators
 - 2. Questions from the Floor for the Chair
- E. Reports from the Officers of Administration and Committees
 - 1. Fall Term Registration Report--Tufts
 - *2. UPC Quarterly Report--Mandaville
 - 3. Report of October 5-6, 1990, IFS Meeting--Hardt
- F. Unfinished Business
- G. New Business
 - *1. Request for Name Change: The School of Extended Studies -- Lall
- H. Adjournment

*The following documents are included with this mailing:

- B Minutes of the October 1, 1990, Senate Meeting*
- E₂ UPC Quarterly Report **
- G_i Request for Name Change: The School of Extended Studies**

**Included for Senators and Ex-officio Members only.

Senators are reminded that they need to turn in the name of an alternate who would attend when necessary. Please submit to the Secretary to the Faculty by November 1, 1990.

Your name

Dept.

Alternate's name

Dept.

PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes: Faculty Senate Meeting, November 5, 1990
Presiding Officer: Sheldon Edner
Secretary: Ulrich H. Hardt

Members Present: Andrews-Collier, Ashbaugh, Becker, Beeson, Bowlden, Brannan, Brennan, Bunch, Burns, Cease, Daily, DeCarrico, Diman, Dunnette, Edner, Enneking, Finley, Fisher, Goslin, Gray, Horowitz, A. Johnson, D. Johnson, Karant-Nunn, Kasal, Kocaoglu, Kosokoff, Lendaris, Limbaugh, Livneh, Lowry, Lutes, Maynard, McKenzie, Millner, Nattinger, Ogle, Olmsted, Rees, Settle, Stern, Terry, Tuttle, Van Halen, Weikel, Wurm, Zwick.

Alternates Present: Julnes for Ellis, Gurtov for Goucher, Bulman for Latz, Westover for Wright.

Members Absent: Arick, Brenner, Casperson, Cooper, Cumpston, Dawson, Duffield, Koch, Manning, McElroy, Petersen.

Ex-officio Members Present: Davidson, Erzurumlu, Hardt, Mackey, Martino, Miller, Nunn, Powell, Ramaley, Reardon, Schendel, Tang, Toulon, Ward.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The minutes of the October 1, 1990, meeting were approved as distributed.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. EDNER reminded Senators that they needed to identify alternates who could attend in their place. [Sixteen (16) Senators have no alternates at this point.]
2. The monthly reception at the K-House following Senate meetings has been changed to a quarterly occurrence, due to low attendance.
3. EDNER reminded everyone to vote on November 6.

QUESTIONS FOR ADMINISTRATORS

ASHBAUGH asked if revised procedural guidelines of departments are being reviewed by OAA. He reported that the biology department guidelines had been submitted May 3, 1990, and there has been no response. He wondered if the delay was due to the upcoming review of the department. REARDON responded that departments had been

asked not to submit revised guidelines until the promotion and tenure review was done.

PRESIDENT'S REPORT

1. RAMALEY distributed a status report on the Campus Security Task Force recommendations (April 16, 1990). The report is attached to these minutes. She pointed out that each one of the 14 recommendations was assigned to some office, program, committee, or department and that most of the recommendations are being worked on; some have already been achieved. But not all recommendations are workable or cost-effective.
2. RAMALEY distributed a copy of the policies and procedures by the central administration according to which the E-Board funds for salary increases are being distributed. (See attached) She said that all criteria were in the document now. PSU was one of 83 institutions used in a comparator list, which also included UO and OSU. The guidelines were reviewed by the administrative council and are in the academic units now to see if the merit processes in each unit can accommodate the guidelines.

ASHBAUGH asked if eligible faculty included department chairs and associate deans. RAMALEY said everyone who had scholarly responsibilities up to the dean's level was included. Recommendations are due in deans' offices by November 22 and to OAA by November 30. Raises are to be effective by January. BURNS asked to have the international education and research category defined, noting that "predominant" responsibility of "internationally active faculty" was nowhere defined. What is important? Would the English department faculty not be widely appropriate? MARTINO said each departmental committee should make the determination. BUNCH observed that "predominant" was never used in the written criteria only verbally.

3. Regarding an update on the planning process described last month, RAMALEY said that members of the sub-committee had been announced in Currently and were at work on step one of the process. Step two would begin in the spring, and Senate involvement will be crucial as budgets, academic plans, campus management priorities, program reviews, etc. are being developed. The existing EPC, UPC and Budget Committee will also be included to ensure faculty involvement and the effective functioning of faculty governance. She asked that governance structure not be changed until we see how it works with this planning process/and can determine which structure works best.
4. Finally, RAMALEY said that the Governor's Commission Final Report would be issued by November 15. Information available suggests that the final version will not be substantially changed from the last one. PSU's central role in the delivery

of higher education in the metropolitan area certainly was emphasized in that report, and we can be pleased with that affirmation.

Following the president's report, the Faculty Senate congratulated the president on the excellent inauguration program and the wonderful celebration. She said she had had great fun orchestrating the program and deeply appreciated the outpouring of support.

REPORTS FROM THE OFFICERS OF ADMINISTRATION AND COMMITTEES

1. Speaking for Tufts, RICKS reported that 14,758 students were enrolled this term, which represents a drop of .05 percent from last year. SCH were down 3.7 percent. BRENNAN asked why there was a drop when we had tried so hard to attract more students after the enrollment limitation had been lifted for this year. RAMALEY said we had heard very late about the lifting of the enrollment cap, and she speculated that people were also wondering about the role of PSU in the future and were waiting for the recommendations of the Governor's Commission report. She also thought that enrollment caps will be reinstated, unless other resources became available.

BEESON recalled that the original purpose of increased enrollment was to support athletics. Do the registration figures mean that we cannot support athletics? MARTINO said that PSU did not increase athletic scholarships at all.

2. MANDAVILLE presented the quarterly UPC report and said that the planning process was going very well.
3. HARDT gave a report of the October IFS meeting (see attached).

NEW BUSINESS

1. LALL presented the proposal for a name change for the Division of Continuing Education and Summer Session to "The School of Extended Studies." The EPC was recommending the change.

NATTINGER asked what the implications of moving from "division" to "school" were. Does a school, for instance, have a permanent faculty? MARTINO replied that school was not a well defined object. ENNEKING wanted to know if summer session could ever really be "extended studies," offering even more of the wonderful array of courses we now feature and perhaps fewer of the regular courses which now make up the bulk of the offerings. DAVIDSON said she saw summer session as an extension of the other three quarters.

CEASE/FISHER moved "that the new name of The School of Extended Studies be accepted as proposed."

The motion was passed.

2. ASHBAUGH presented a motion, growing out of the AAUP Oregon Conference, objecting to the use of the academic budget for non-academic purposes, i.e., athletics (see attached text).

ASHBAUGH/FINLEY "moved the adoption of this resolution."

CEASE asked about the meaning of the resolution. ASHBAUGH replied it was difficult to speculate at this time, given the tax limitation measure on tomorrow's ballot. TOULAN warned about the negative side of the resolution. Would below-limit enrollment monies go to non-academic programs under this proposal? MARTINO pointed out the resolution inaccuracies regarding fall enrollments.

Given these unresolved questions, BRENNAN/LENDARIS moved to table the resolution until further information became available.

The motion to table was passed.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 16:13.

Doc. 5/10/30/90

PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY
Campus Security Task Force Report
Status As Of October 15, 1990

Background

October 18, 1989 Interim President Edgington appointed a nineteen person Campus Security Task Force to study campus safety and security focusing on the following issues: 1) perceived and actual personal safety; 2) safety information, communication and education; 3) crime prevention strategies; 4) response to incidents; and 5) environmental factors. The Task Force was instructed to make recommendations where appropriate for improvements.

Report Summary

The final report was issued on April 16, 1990 which contained fourteen recommendations and the following summary.

The task force was not able to completely describe the crime picture on campus because much of the needed data was lacking. Nevertheless, according to the available recorded data PSU does not seem to have a violent crime problem. However, there were a large number of reported property crimes--mostly thefts. In general, the campus has been reasonably safe for at least the past ten years. The CSSO should receive praise for doing many right things with minimal resources.

Clearly, there is a considerable amount of apathy among the campus community. The reasons for this lack of expressed concern is difficult to determine.

Our recommendations are meant to improve the level of safety and security on campus by maximizing the use of existing resources. Some recommendations will enhance the collection and analysis of data so potential problems can be quickly identified and resolved; some will make more effective use of human resources; and some will require changes in current operations to improve existing services.

Status of Recommendations

The following abbreviation codes were used:

AJ = Administration of Justice Department
AS = Auxiliary Services Department
CEP = Cooperative Education Program
CSSO = Campus Safety and Security Office
FADM = Finance and Administration Office
GS&R = Graduate Studies and Research
OAA = Office of Academic Affairs
OIRP = Office of Institutional Research and Planning
OSA = Office of Student Affairs
PP = Physical Plant
PPB = Portland Police Bureau
PO = President's Office
PUB = Publications Board
RFPs = Request for Proposals
USP = Urban Studies and Planning Department
WU = Women's Union


<u>Recommendation</u>	<u>Responsible Office</u>	<u>Current Status</u>
The report contains a general recommendation that CSSO needs additional personnel.	FADM	Two public safety officer positions have been granted to CSSO.
1a. Obtain crime reports from PPB and analyze all crimes committed within University District to identify problems and recommend appropriate action.	CSSO	PPB crimes are now reviewed daily by CSSO and appropriately reported on.
1b. Include PPB crimes in annual CSSO Report.	CSSO	Plan is to include PPB in 1990-91 Report. Also working with AJ to improve reporting and crime pattern analysis.
2. Annual Spring survey of University District population to determine levels of fear and of crime, as well as attitudes about CSSO.	AJ OIRP	Survey will be developed by AJ and OIRP for issuance in Spring 1991.
3. Plan and publish brochure that meets requirements of Security Information Act.	CSSO PUB	Have developed and distributed security handbook. CSSO has also prepared and distributed various single topic pamphlets.
4. Publish weekly criminal activity in Vanguard	CSSO PUB	Weekly crime reports provided to departments and Vanguard. The Vanguard is publishing this information biweekly.
5. Prepare and implement Campus Watch Program	CSSO	Have implemented Campus Watch program and designated a Crime Prevention Officer. Steps have been taken to involve OSA and PSS in program.
6. Request AJ 220 to be a specific general education requirement for all students or AJ 220 and AJ330 as elective courses for social science requirement and include campus crime materials in freshman and transfer orientation programs.	AJ OAA OSA	The Faculty Senate President Officer has requested that the Academic Requirement Committee review and report on the feasibility of the recommendations by the end of the 1990-91 Academic year.

<u>Recommendation</u>	<u>Responsible Office</u>	<u>Current Status</u>
Jointly plan and offer a course that would survey and evaluate physical features of the campus and recommend improvements.	AJ USP CSSO AS PP	CSSO currently does limited surveys. The survey and evaluation course is being developed for possible offering during the 1991-92 academic year.
Jointly develop a plan to provide a coordinated, improved, and adequately funded escort service.	CSSO WU OSA	CSSO provides an escort service upon request. A coordination of escort services still needs to be developed.
Jointly develop and implement an on-going student campus security cooperative education and practicum program.	CSSO COOP/ED AJ	A practicum program has been developed which had 2 student participants in 1990 Spring Term. No students signed up for Fall term.
0. Hire contractor to review and evaluate CSSO's performance and operations.	FADM Task Force	First CSSO is being asked to complete a self-evaluation using guidelines from the American Council on Education. The appropriateness of contracting for an independent study will be determined after the self evaluation in the Spring of 1991.
1. Develop research agenda to match campus security problems with research interests of faculty and graduate students.	GS & R AJ	GS & R is working with AJ to develop a research agenda to match campus security problems with research interests of faculty and graduate students. Completion expected by Spring 1991.
2. Issue several RFP's each year addressing campus crime-related problems and fund promising proposals.	OAA AJ	OAA is examining the feasibility of issuing the recommended RFPs during the 1990-91 academic year.
Request Mayor to assign a PPB community policing officer to PSU on part-time basis for technical assistance.	PO	Request letter has been prepared and will be presented to President.
Continue the work of the Task Force as an administrative advisory committee.	PO FADM	The Campus Parking, Environment and Safety Committee will be asked to monitor the implementation of the recommendations in this report.

Doc 11.013.190

PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY
OFFICE OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS
October 22, 1990

To: Members of Executive Committee, Senate Steering Committee,
President's Advisory Council, and AAUP Council

From: Frank Martino 

I am enclosing a copy of the policies and procedures according to which the E-Board funds for salary increases are being distributed. The criteria applicable to each of these categories are stated, the process for review by department and dean are described, and the formulas determining the distribution to the deans of the Schools and the College are explained. The opportunity for rewarding outstanding meritorious performance within the University in a significant way has been all too rare in recent history. Therefore, now, although the resources could be larger, and the applicability broader, nonetheless, it is particularly pleasant to have the means at least partially to begin to address the problem and improve our academic salary level.

DRAFT

The Office of Academic Affairs
10/24/90

POLICIES AND PROCEDURES FOR ALLOCATION OF E-BOARD FUNDS FOR SALARY INCREASES

Distribution guidelines for these funds were issued on September 19, 1990 (see attached). These guidelines outlined the legislative intent for the use of the funds by distribution into three categories: Category A, Engineering and related Physical Sciences; Category B, International Education and Research; and Category C, Market Factors, Compression and Equity. The following policies and procedures implement the guidelines, with one revision: the comparator list, for the calculation of market competitiveness factors, has been expanded to a list of 83 institutions which were used in a salary study commissioned by NASULGC last year.

CRITERIA

Recommendations for raises within all categories should be based on the criteria of meritorious contributions to teaching, research or community service. Explicit reference to the bases for the recommended salary increases founded on these criteria should accompany the recommendations at all levels. Within category A, these criteria should include funded research, research productivity, involvement with industry, involvement in the improvement of math and science education and the recruitment of students in the fields of engineering and sciences. Within category B, special considerations for criteria include meritorious contribution to instruction, research productivity and community service in areas related to international affairs. Any of the above special or general criteria are applicable to category C. Formulas for the allocations to the professional schools and the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences are explained below. They are based on numerical measurements of salary compression and market competitiveness, and on salary base comparisons for faculty identified by mission considerations, as discussed below. These formulas are not meant to be used to determine recommendations for the actual salary adjustments, which are to be given on the basis of the criteria.

REVIEW PROCESS

In all three categories the deans will ask the departments to make recommendations to them on the basis of the criteria that have been established for each category and the explicit legislative intent as described in the enclosed guidelines. In order to make departmental recommendations most effective and appropriate, the deans will ask the departments to assess their existing evaluation processes with respect to their ability to respond to the present unusually defined guidelines. The departments may need to consider modifying their processes in consultation with the deans to more effectively respond to these guidelines. The deans will report to the faculty on the outcome of the decanal review process and provide a summary, by departmental total, of their recommendations. Recommendations for salary increases resulting from these policies and procedures will be restricted to a range from a minimum of \$2,000 per year to a maximum of \$5,000 per year in steps of \$1,000.

DISTRIBUTION FORMULAS

The funds in the three categories are allocated to the deans of the professional schools and the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences according to formulas described below. The formulas are meant to reflect the intended purpose of each category in a precise and unambiguous fashion. Clearly, there is no single best possible set of formulas for accomplishing this purpose. The formulas we have used are founded on departmental salary bases and on average salary comparisons. The numerical results are not meant to be prescriptions for determining the actual salary raises either to individual departments or individual faculty members. These are to be based on the criteria and the review processes outlined above.

CATEGORY A: Engineering and related Physical Sciences

The allocations under category A are based on a list of appropriate departments designated by the Chancellor's office in its central allocation scheme.. Our allocations have been determined by the ratios of the total faculty salary base in each of the designated departments to the total salary base in all of these departments. This calculation leads to allocations to the deans of the School of Engineering and Applied Sciences and the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences as listed below.

Category B: International Education and Research

Allocations within category B are allocated to the deans of the individual academic units on the basis of the proportional amount of the salary base of appropriate faculty in that unit as a ratio of the total salary base of the internationally active faculty.

CATEGORY C: Market Factors, Compression, and Equity

For the allocations to the units of the funds in category C, data measuring salary compression and market equity for each of the departments at PSU have been compiled. With respect to salary compression, ratios of full professor salaries to assistant professor salaries were calculated, as well as ratios of associate professor salaries to assistant professor salaries. The Schools and College will receive a share of these funds for each department whose ratios are lower than the university-wide mean of these ratios. Once again that share has been determined, in this case department by department and rank by rank, according to the appropriate ratios of the salary bases involved. Similarly, each department's relative competitiveness in the national market is measured by comparing a weighted average of PSU salaries to a similarly weighted average of salaries in a national survey of 83 universities which was conducted by NASULGC for the 1989-90 academic year. The Schools and College will receive a share of these funds for those departments whose ratios are worse than the mean of this comparative study. Those departments no worse than one standard deviation from the mean, or among the best off with respect to compression, will be weighted by a factor of one half compared to the others. The share of the funds for both compression and market considerations is determined by ratios of the salary base of each department to the total salary base but with compression weighted three times market competitiveness. It is possible for an individual department to be credited both for a share for compression and a share for market competitiveness. An additional fraction of the category C funds, approximately 15%, has been allocated to academic units on the basis of mission considerations, including involvement in community service projects and cooperative research and

instructional programs. These formulas result in the distribution of category C funds listed below.

ADJUSTMENTS:

Two funds will be retained centrally by the Provost. A fund equal to 5% of each of the three categories, A, B, and C, will be retained to address individual anomalies resulting from the general distribution formulas. Examples of such anomalies would be very small departments for whom one may not use national comparators, or the presence of scientists or engineers on the faculty of departments which were not on the original list of departments coming from the Chancellor's office. The second fund of 10% of each of the three categories will be reserved for faculty for whom there is a particular risk of their leaving PSU or for the recognition and reward of outstanding achievement in each of the categories in the following areas: interdisciplinary scholarship, curricular development, demonstrable particularly meritorious contributions to teaching, and particular involvement with community efforts in each of the three categories. In the case of category A, Engineering and related Physical Sciences, particularly strong involvement with industrial relations will be a part of this consideration.

The deans will make recommendations to the provost for use of the two centrally held categories (5% for anomalies and 10% for the special categories outlined above). The deans will meet as a group to devise a final allocation list for these funds.

The resulting allocations for the academic units in each of the three categories is as follows:

Category A:

CLAS	\$	68,661
SEAS	\$	49,128

Category B:

CLAS	\$	68,294
BA	\$	11,759
ED	\$	1,824
EAS	\$	5,895
FPA	\$	1,549
UPA	\$	8,582

Category C (including mission adjustments):

CLAS	\$	80,972
BA	\$	108,090
ED	\$	10,000
EAS	\$	34,502
FPA	\$	24,842
HPE	\$	5,000
SSW	\$	10,000
UPA	\$	12,767
Library	\$	5,000
SYSC	\$	2,540

PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY
OFFICE OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS
September 19, 1990

**PROPOSED DISTRIBUTION GUIDELINES
E-BOARD FUNDS FOR SALARY INCREASES**

Portland State University has received notice of its share of the E-Board monies for faculty salary increases (see attached memo from Chancellor's Office, September 7, 1990). These guidelines are applicable to full time faculty involved in teaching and research. The salary increases will begin in December and are retroactive to the beginning of the 1990-91 contract year.

1. SALARY FUNDS AVAILABLE

The following salary funds are available for distribution to the faculty groups indicated. The corresponding Other Payroll Expenses(OPE) will follow the salary distribution.

Engineering and related physical sciences	\$138,574
Faculty in internationally related educational and research programs	\$115,181
Merit, Contribution, Salary Compression, Market and Retention factors	<u>\$345,544</u>
	<u>\$599,299</u>

2. GUIDELINES FOR DISTRIBUTION

The Office of the Chancellor has provided guidance on the understanding reached with the E-Board about the intended use of these funds and the criteria to be used in distributing the salary increases. The following guidelines and criteria are in accordance with legislative intent.

CATEGORY A: Engineering and related Physical Sciences.

A portion of the funds (approximately 20%) is to be set aside specifically for faculty in this category. These funds will be distributed to faculty in the Departments listed below on the basis of the following criteria:

Research productivity, funded research, and involvement with industry.

School of Engineering
Mathematical Sciences
Chemistry.
Geology
Physics
Environmental Science

CATEGORY B: INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION AND RESEARCH

A second portion of the allocation(20%) is to be distributed to faculty who have a primary teaching and research interest in and who participate actively in internationally related educational and research programs. All teaching and research faculty, including those in engineering and the related physical sciences can be considered for this salary increase on the basis of a significant contribution to our international programs. A fund for this purpose will be retained in the Provost's Office and the Deans should propose candidates to receive salary increases based on the following criteria: quality instruction in core international courses; research productivity; and community service in areas related to international affairs.

CATEGORY C: MARKET FACTORS, COMPRESSION AND EQUITY:

The remaining portion of the funds(60%) are be used to recognize faculty who have made especially meritorious contributions to research, teaching or community service, whose work is especially relevant to our mission as an urban university and/or whose current salary is seriously out of line with market conditions. Particular concern will be given to the situation of faculty in those departments where market conditions have required significantly higher starting salaries and consequently severe salary compression may have occurred. All faculty, whether or not they were considered in Categories A and/or B are eligible for consideration in Category C.

Funds to be used to recognize meritorious performance or to relieve salary inequities due to compression or inversion created by recent hiring will be distributed by the Provost to the academic programs using the following guidelines:

(1) Current competitiveness of the salaries in the unit, in comparison to average salaries for similar disciplines in a select group of seventeen urban universities which are judged comparable to Portland State. Salary comparisons will be based on a study commissioned for this purpose from the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges. The comparisons are based on 1989-90 data and the list of institutions has been selected from the comparator list maintained by the Oregon State System of Higher Education used for evaluating salary competitiveness at Portland State University.,

COMPARATOR LIST

University of Alabama at Birmingham
University of Alabama
University of Arkansas
Georgia State University
University of Illinois at Chicago
University of Louisville
University of Mississippi
University of Montana
State University of New York at Binghamton
Kent State University
Miami
Clemson University
University of Texas at Arlington
University of Houston at University Park
Texas Tech University
University of Wisconsin at Milwaukee

(2) Recent experiences of the unit in attracting strong candidates for available positions and in recruiting new faculty.

(3) Productivity of the unit based on research activity, teaching loads and community service involvement.

(4) Recent patterns of faculty turnover due to resignations or recent experience with recruitment of our faculty by other institutions.

3. PROCESS OF REVIEW

The Deans will review the contributions of eligible members of the teaching and research faculty and will make recommendations to the Provost. Faculty who are not recommended may request a written explanation from the appropriate Dean and may appeal recommendations to the Provost and thence to the President if desired.

**Highlights of the Oct. 5-6, 1990, IFS Meeting at the OSU
Marine Science Center, Newport**

1. IFS listened to a report by Chancellor Bartlett, a good new/bad news picture. He said that things were pretty bad in Oregon and were not getting better in the resource-short society. The good news was that there is dialogue among the OSSHE institutions, comradeship, leadership and much talent. He urged schools not to waste energies on bickering among themselves. He was particularly excited and pleased about new leadership in his office and the state and specifically named Shirley Clark, Weldon Ihrig, Roger Bassett, and Judith Ramaley. Ramaley was praised for her energy, talent and perspective.

Bartlett said he was keeping his fingers crossed on what the Portland Commission [sic] is going to suggest. He said one hears things that could be a problem. Meanwhile, he said, the state system had to work on long-term planning on such issues as internationalization, economic development, diversification of society and economics, the work force and the retraining of it, continuing education for students and non-traditional people, EdNet, engineering.

When asked to list the pluses and minuses in Oregon, he did:

- ◀ Oregon has better quality people in state government (e.g., the governor); state government is basically honest, not corrupt. The state is small enough to maintain a humaneness; one can still talk to people directly. There is still a Jeffersonian residue remaining in Oregon, but it is fading. People are here because they want to be here pursuing their life and work.
 - ◀ Some of the disadvantages about Oregon are that the state has not believed that higher education is important. And Oregon has not organized and has lived off by itself; many people still think that they can decide by themselves what our education should be. He said that cannot be done anymore. We must look at the world and be concerned about what's happening in Bonn, Paris, Tokyo and London. We must become competitive, and our students must become competent to live in the world. Allocating fiscal resources for education is another problem in Oregon. The financial support for K-12 education in Oregon is not bad, but support for education beyond grade 12 is a real problem in comparison to the rest of the country. Long-range planning in the legislature is a problem. Lots of things which are desirable are not affordable; we can't have everything we want, even if we can make a good case for it. But we must plan for future needs. Oregon now has 63,000 students in college. By 2000, the state will need 75,000 higher education students.
2. Vice Chancellor Shirley Clark also made her first appearance at IFS. She identified the following priorities for the U.S.: the quality of undergraduate education, minority students, financial support for research and economic development, planning, faculty recruitment and salaries, reform of teacher education, linking higher with K-12 education, and tuition. Of particular concern in the western U.S. she listed faculty salaries and recruitment, as well as maintenance of buildings and plants. In Oregon there are high priorities like teacher education, continuing education through inter-institutional cooperation, linkage with K-12 education and increased requirements for admission to colleges, ethnic minority mix among students, needs of non-traditional students, program development and curriculum review and revision -- new programs must be constantly evolving, but we can't continue to duplicate programs in a time of financial shortages. Faculty development needs support such as seed money for research and travel; there must be strategies for renewal.
 3. During discussion, Chancellor Bartlett talked more about "the Portland problem." The Portland area is most underserved. More growth, disproportionate growth, will come to Portland. The issue of program duplication therefore is going to be a big problem. There must be cooperation with other schools in Portland--joint, collaborative, and participatory programs. Duplication for its own sake is wasteful and cannot be tolerated. Generally there is not a big problem of duplication in Oregon.

But there ought to be some programs done in Portland offered by other schools. There ought to be some programs done by PSU. And there ought to be some programs, such as engineering, done by joint ventures. Everyone will lose if it's win or lose.

UO and OSU should not be growing but should strengthen what they're doing. PSU should grow and develop more advanced programs. It can add many more without having a duplication problem. PSU would be the "host" for joint programs with other schools, OSSHE institutions and private agencies. The chancellor also mentioned that he was not that interested in a school's mission statement, although it is valuable as you work through it.

4. In other business, the IFS heard reports about the June, July, and September board and academic council meetings. It also established its own agenda for the year, which includes discussion of faculty development and renewal, quality of undergraduate programs, improving the relationship between higher and K-12 education. In that regard, the IFS passed a resolution urging the chancellor's office to immediately enter into discussion with public schools (e.g., the Oregon Education Association and the Oregon School Boards Association) concerning the contemplated increase in foreign language requirement for admission into OSSHE schools, rather than working on that issue in isolation from the public schools. The IFS also met with Roger Bassett and made plans for its legislative agenda for the year which will include further meetings with Bassett and with Mark Nelson, lobbyist for AOF. Finally, at the December 7-8 meeting the IFS plans to discuss each school's handling of the E-Board money.

AAUP OREGON CONFERENCE

American Association of University Professors

325 Sunset Drive

Eugene, Oregon 97403

*Best
I would like to
introduce the at
Nov 5 meeting*

*Jmr
Ashbaugh*

October 19, 1990

TO: CONFERENCE OFFICERS AND CHAPTER PRESIDENTS

FROM: JETTA SIEGEL, EXECUTIVE SECRETARY

RE: MOTION TO BE PRESENTED TO FACULTY SENATES AT USO, UO, AND PSU

At the Conference meeting held in Corvallis last week, Barry Siegel agreed to draft a motion regarding the use of the academic budget for non academic purposes (namely, the athletic deficit). The following first draft is presented for your comments:

Whereas:

1. Lean academic budgets and a concern for the deteriorating quality of undergraduate education led the Oregon State Board of Higher Education (OSBHE) in 1989 to adopt a policy of limiting student enrollments at the State Systems colleges and universities,
2. In 1990, continuing deficits have left a total debt of \$6 million in athletic departments of the three State System universities and have caused the OSBHE to admit hundreds of additional students above established enrollment ceilings at the three universities for the sole purpose of using extra tuition income to fund the deficits,
3. And the OSBHE has stated that its decision to violate previously established enrollment ceilings is a temporary expedient, designed to buy time to devise a permanent solution to the problem of athletic departments' deficits,

Be it resolved that

The ^{PSU} Senate request that, beginning with the 1991-92 academic year, the OSBHE allocate the tuition income derived from above-limit enrollments to the academic budgets of the institutions whose enrollments exceed their previously assigned limits. It also requests that the OSBHE require the institutions to begin reducing their enrollments to their previously established limits until such time as the legislature increases the institutions' base budgets by enough to fund enrollments that exceed those limits without threatening the quality of undergraduate education at those institutions.

UNIVERSITY PLANNING COUNCIL

Quarterly Report to the Faculty Senate

November 5, 1990

Review of UPC Activities 1989-90

During 1989-90 the UPC was engaged in discussion of and recommendations for the implementation of The PSU Plan for the 90s, and analysis of the management document Planning, Budgeting, and Academic Management Analysis and Recommendations (for PSU) produced by a 21 person working group which included some members of the UPC and was headed by Dean Nohad Toulan. A UPC subcommittee studied the process of environmental assessment to be used in future planning activities. Proposed goals at PSU for minority recruitment, retention, and graduation were reviewed. During the spring meetings serious consideration was given to a restructuring of the UPC to increase its effectiveness in carrying out the responsibilities allotted it by the Faculty Senate. Recommendations resulting from this consideration will be placed before the Senate for action this year.

1989-90 was an administrative transition year, not an easy time for medium and long range planning. The out-going chairperson, Nancy Matschek, deserves applause for her persistence and dedication in keeping the Council on track and working hard.

Plans for Planning in 1990-91

1989-90 was a transition year; 1990-91 clearly will be one of rededication and intense review and planning. The new administration is anxious to lay out as quickly as possible its own development program for PSU. A subcommittee of the UPC and other faculty and administrators has been formed in cooperation with the President's Office 1) to review and revise the University's Mission Statement and 2) to review the Plan for the 80s, Plan for the 90s, and the Governor's Commission Report. From the latter documents, representing years of thought and planning by the faculty, a summary will be produced, along with an analysis of the extent to which the main goals of each have been met. The product of this work will be combined with parallel studies done by other working groups on space management and facilities, finance, and communications. The end-of-year result will be a coordinated and practical set of academic and administrative guidelines for PSU to be implemented in the coming decade.

At the same time, other UPC subcommittees will be engaged in special planning and implementation reviews of priority programs such as minority recruitment and retention as they occur.

Barry Anderson	CLAS
Margaret Browning	AO
Lewis Goslin	BA
Nancy Matschek	FPA
Janet Wright	LIB
Walter Ellis	PA
Carol Burden	ED
Jeanette DeCarrico	CLAS
Marjorie Burns	CLAS
Robert Jones	CLAS
Kent Lall	EAS
Norm Wyers	SW
Lindsey Stone	BAO
Jon Mandaville	CLAS, Chair
Frank Martino	OAA
Nohad Toulan	UPA
Gary Powell	FADM
Jack Schendel	HPE

REQUEST FOR NAME CHANGE:
DIVISION OF CONTINUING EDUCATION AND SUMMER SESSION

In order to:

- * represent the new organization that was formed with the joining of Continuing Education and Summer Session
- * bring Continuing Education and Summer Session into line with other academic units on campus, and reinforce the centrality of this unit to PSU's mission
- * create a new awareness of the outreach mission of PSU, and emphasize the idea of Continuing Education and Summer Session's role in extending the resources of the campus and going beyond its boundaries
- * establish an identity that is comprehensive enough to capture the diversity of the 14 programs with the organization,

the following new name is proposed for the Division of Continuing Education and Summer Session:

The School of Extended Studies

Each program within the organization will retain its own name identity in conjunction with the new title, e.g., Summer Session will continue to be known as Summer Session, The School of Extended Studies.

Recommended approval on October 8, 1990, by the Educational Policies Committee